

REMARKS

[0004] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application in view of the foregoing claim amendments and the following remarks. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-12, 14-22, and 24-36 are currently pending
- Claims 13 and 23 were previously canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein
- Claims 1, 7, 12, 21, and 31 are amended herein

[0005] Support for the amendments to Claims 1, 7, 12, 21, and 31 is found in the originally filed specification in at least paragraphs [0011], [0020], [0023], and [0024]. No new matter is being introduced thereby.

Cited Documents

[0006] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Rathbone: Rathbone, "Windows XP for Dummies", Wiley Publishing, Inc., 2001, pp 1-17.
- Straub: Straub et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,905,492
- Hilbert: Hilbert et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088570

Claims 1-12, 14-22, 24-36 are Non-Obvious over Rathbone in view of Straub, in further view of Hilbert

[0007] Claims 1-12, 14-22, 24-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

allegedly being obvious over Rathbone in view of Straub, in further view of Hilbert. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. However, in spite of Applicant's traversal, without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, and for the sole purpose of expediting allowance of the present application, Applicant hereby amends independent Claims 1, 7, 12, 21, and 31 in the manner set forth above.

Independent Claim 1

[0008] For at least the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Rathbone, Straub, and Hilbert neither disclose or suggest at least the following features recited in independent Claim 1:

a desktop page configured to display in response to a selectable logon control being selected, the desktop page further configured to display user selectable controls in one or more regions of the desktop page and persistently display the user identifiable indicator corresponding to the selectable logon control from display of the logon page to display of the desktop page;

a transition from the logon page to the desktop page, the transition configured to display after the selectable logon control has been selected but prior to display of the desktop page, the transition further configured to display the user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the selectable logon control uninterrupted throughout the transition and to gradually display elimination of non-selected selectable logon controls, thereby enhancing a computing session by providing seamless continuity when a user logs onto the computing system; and

a start control displayed on the desktop page that is user-selectable to initiate that multiple applications start together at approximately a same time, the start control being configured to enable the user to select groups of applications to start together that were executing when a previous computing session was discontinued, that are often selected for use by the user, that were recently selected for use by the user, and that are most used by the user.

More particularly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner-cited combination of

references does not disclose or suggest “persistently display the user identifiable indicator corresponding to the selectable logon control from display of the logon page to display of the desktop page,” as presently recited in Claim 1.

[0009] The Action asserts that “Straub teaches a desktop page being further configured to persistently display the user identifiable indicator corresponding to the selectable logon control (taught as the ability to customize [i.e. “further configure”] a desktop background to display any graphic image selected by a user, which would include said user-identifiable indicator, at col. 2, lines 20-29)” (Office Action, p. 7). Further, the Action states that “[b]y configuring the background to display the user-identifiable indicator, Straub thus teaches the claimed persistent display of said indicator” (Office Action, p. 7). For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0010] Applicant submits that, with respect to the “Windows 95 graphical user interface,” Straub discloses that “it is possible to add additional icons onto the desktop to represent other application programs, documents, files, and resources” and “[a] graphic image can be selected as a background of the desktop (called “wallpaper”) in place of the default solid color background” (Col. 2, lines 20-29). That is, Straub merely alleges that the Windows 95 graphical user interface allows a user to customize a desktop by addition additional icons and to select a graphic image as a background of the desktop. Claim 1, on the other hand, recites “persistently display the user identifiable indicator corresponding to the selectable logon control from display of the logon page to display of the desktop page” (emphasis added). Furthermore, solely because a graphical image may be used as a “wallpaper” for the desktop does not

necessarily mean that the recited “user identifiable indicator” is persistently displayed “from display of the logon page to display of the desktop page,” as presently recited in Claim 1. Moreover, the Examiner-cited combination of Rathbone, Straub, and Hilbert does not disclose or suggest that the same selected “user identifiable indicator” is “persistently” displayed throughout from the logon page, to the transition page, to the desktop page, as presently recited. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Rathbone, Straub, and Hilbert does not disclose or suggest the above recitation.

[0011] Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Rathbone, Straub, and Hilbert neither discloses nor suggests “the transition further configured to display the user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the selectable logon control uninterrupted throughout the transition and to gradually display elimination of non-selected selectable logon controls,” as presently recited in Claim1 (emphasis added).

With respect to the above underlined recitation, the Action asserts that “[t]he Examiner further contends that as Rathbone shows a plurality of selectable logon controls (Fig. 4-1), in combination with the single user display on a transition as in Hilbert (Figs. 3 and 4) one would necessarily obtain a transition page that displays elimination of non-selected selectable logon controls” (Office Action, p. 8). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

[0012] Given the above assertion set forth in the Action (“one would necessarily obtain”), Applicant respectfully submits that the recitation “to gradually display elimination of non-selected selectable logon controls” is not explicitly disclosed by the combination of Rathbone and Hilbert. However, even assuming for the sake of argument that the above combination of references discloses that “one would

necessarily obtain a transition page that displays elimination of non-selectable logon controls” (Office Action, p. 8), to which Applicant does not acquiesce, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Rathbone and Hilbert do not disclose how the recited “non-selected selectable logon controls” are eliminated. On the contrary, independent Claim 1 recites “to gradually display elimination of non-selected selectable logon controls.” Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Rathbone, Straub, and Hilbert fail to disclose or suggest the above recitation.

[0013] In addition, Applicant hereby amends independent Claim 1 to recite “a start control displayed on the desktop page that is user-selectable to initiate that multiple applications start together at approximately a same time, the start control being configured to enable the user to select groups of applications to start together that were executing when a previous computing session was discontinued, that are often selected for use by the user, that were recently selected for use by the user, and that are most used by the user.” It is respectfully noted that the above features are newly recited in Claim 1 and, therefore, amended Claim 1 has not been previously rejected. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Rathbone, Straub, and Hilbert is completely silent with respect to the above recitation. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth herein, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 is patentable over Rathbone, Straub, and Hilbert, both singularly and in combination with one another.

Independent Claims 7, 12, 21, and 31

[0014] Independent Claims 7, 12, 21, and 31 recite features similar to those

discussed above with regard to independent Claim 1, which is patentable over the combination of Rathbone, Straub, and Hilbert for at least the foregoing reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 7, 12, 21, and 31 are also patentable over Rathbone, Straub, and Hilbert, both singularly and in combination with one another, for at least the reasons set forth above.

Dependent Claims 2-6, 8-11, 14-20, 22, 24-30, and 32-36

[0015] As stated above, independent Claims 1, 7, 12, 21, and 31 are patentable over Rathbone in view of Straub, in further view of Hilbert. Accordingly, dependent Claims 2-6, 8-11, 14-20, 22, 24-30, and 32-36 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 7, 12, 21, and 31, as well as for the additional features that Claims 2-6, 8-11, 14-20, 22, 24-30, and 32-36 recite.

[0016] Thus, Rathbone, Straub, and Hilbert, whether taken alone or in combination (assuming for the sake of argument that they can be combined), fail to disclose or suggest the recitations of independent Claims 1, 7, 12, 21, and 31. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 7, 12, 21, and 31 are patentable over the proposed combination of references. Furthermore, dependent Claims 2-6, 8-11, 14-20, 22, 24-30, and 32-36 are also patentable over the above combination of references by virtue of their dependency on independent Claims 1, 7, 12, 21, and 31, as well as for the additional features that each claim recites. Applicant also respectfully requests individual consideration of each dependent claim.

[0017] Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-12, 14-22, and 24-36 are not obvious over the combination of Rathbone, Straub, and Hilbert, and therefore, the present rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

[0018] For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-12, 14-22, and 24-36 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and an early notice of allowance.

[0019] The arguments and amendments presented herein were necessitated by the most recent Office Action and because Applicant earnestly believes the claims were in condition for allowance at the time of filing of Applicant's previous response. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Brett J. Schlameus/ Dated: 10/29/2009
Brett J. Schlameus (brett@leehayes.com; 206-876-6022)
Registration No. 60827

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert C. Peck (robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)
Registration No. 56826